## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

MEE. SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:05 CV 7056

-VS-

ORDER

DAIMLERCHRYSLER CORPORATION

Defendant.

KATZ, J.

This matter is before the Court on Mee Sanders' ("Plaintiff") motion to strike Daimler Chrysler Corp.'s ("Defendant") motion for reconsideration (Doc. 109) and Defendant's opposition (Doc. 110).

The Court issued a memorandum opinion (Doc. 101) in the underlying matter on November 9, 2006, granting partial summary judgment. On December 22, 2006, Defendant filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's opinion (Doc. 108).

Plaintiff argues that Defendant's motion for reconsideration is untimely, because under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) a party must move the court to amend or alter a judgment within 10 days. This Court has treated motions for reconsideration in the past, under the general rubrics of a motion to alter or amend made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). However, the 10-day limitation in 59(e) applies only to final judgments. A grant of partial summary judgment is not a final judgment. See Leelanau Wine Cellars, Ltd. v. Black & Red, Inc., 118 Fed. Appx. 942, 946 (6th

Case: 3:05-cv-07056-DAK Doc #: 112 Filed: 02/01/07 2 of 2. PageID #: 515

Cir. 2004) (because the district court ruled on partial summary judgment, its order was

interlocutory in nature, not final, and was not subject to the 10-day limitation of 59(e)).

In the underlying case at bar, the Court's opinion (Doc. 101) only granted summary

judgment on one issue on the merits, leaving open for litigation at least two other issues. The

opinion was styled as an order granting partial summary judgment. It was thus not a final

judgment, but was interlocutory, for purposes of a motion for reconsideration, even pursuant to

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).

For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion to strike as untimely Defendant's motion for

reconsideration (Doc. 109) is hereby denied. Furthermore, Plaintiff shall have 10 days from the

issuance of this order in which to file a memorandum of law in response to Defendant's motion for

reconsideration.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ David A. Katz

DAVID A. KATZ

U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE

2